DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 637 HE 005 391

AUTHOR Lunney, Gerald H.
TITLE Attitudes of Senior Students From a Small Liberal Arts College Concerning Faculty and Course Evaluation: Some Possible Explanations of Evaluation Results. Research Report Number 32.
INSTITUTION Centre Coll. of Kentucky, Danville.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research (Washington, D. C., May 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Colleges; *College Students; *Course Evaluation; Effective Teaching; *Higher Education; Liberal Arts; Questionnaires; Research Projects; Seniors; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Part I of this report describes the attitudes of senior students toward course evaluation as measured on a thirty-seven item questionnaire. It shows that the students' response is related to the academic preparation they have received. In general students want evaluations to provide information to instructors concerning their courses and teaching. Part II assumes that student characteristics are related to student attitudes and that attitudes are related to responses on course evaluations. Evidence is presented that tends to support this assumption, but the author cautions against placing too much weight on this evidence. (Author)

ED 089637

CENTRE COLLEGE OF KENTUCKY
DANVILLE, KENTUCKY 40422

RESEARCH REPORT

Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Number 32

April 1974

ATTITUDES OF SENIOR STUDENTS FROM A SMALL LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE CONCERNING FACULTY AND COURSE EVALUATION: SOME POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS OF EVALUATION RESULTS

Gerald H. Lunney
Director of Institutional Research and Evaluation
The Centre College of Kentucky
Danville, Kentucky 40422
(606) 236-5211

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 00 5 391

Paper presented at the annual forum of the Association for Institutional Research, May 1974.

ABSTRACT

This paper consists of two parts.

Part I describes the attitudes of senior students toward course evaluation as measured on a thirty-seven item questionnaire. It shows that the students' response is related to the academic preparation they have received. In general students want evaluations to provide information to instructors concerning their courses and teaching.

Part II assumes that student characteristics are related to student attitudes and that attitudes are related to responses on course evaluations. Evidence is presented which tends to support this assumption but the author cautions against placing too much weight on this evidence.

ATTITUDES OF SENIOR STUDENTS FROM A SMALL LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE CONCERNING FACULTY AND COURSE EVALUATION: SOME POSSIBLE EXPLANATIONS OF EVALUATION RESULTS

by
Gerald H. Lurney, The Centre College of Kentucky

Associated with the current pressure for accountability in education is the increasing popularity of the evaluation of instruction and courses by students. The use of evaluations of this nature in higher education has increased as a variety of forces have affected colleges and universities. Rating forms have been developed, or borrowed, or bought, and have been used for a variety of purposes on college campuses whose natures and purposes cover the spectrum of post-secondary education. However, little attention has been paid to the attitudes of students who complete the forms. Costin, Greenough, and Menges (1971) were unable to cite any research concerning student attitudes toward course evaluation in their review of the research on student ratings of college teaching and supplemented the review with their own brief assessment of student attitudes. Yet the student's attitude and perception of what he is doing when he rates a course or an instructor is of paramount importance to the evaluation process. As Remmers (1963) states:

> ...the measuring device is not the paper form but rather the individual rater....In addition to any limitations imposed by the form itself, ratings are limited by the characteristics of the human rater - his inevitably selective perception, memory, and forgetting, his lack of sensitivity to what may be psychologically and socially important, his inaccuracies of observation...

The current study was conducted in an attempt to focus attention on the importance of the attitudes with which students approach the rating of instruction and to provide data concerning this attitudes. The study is divided into two parts. The first represents a direct assessment of student attitudes. The second part considers four hypotheses which flow from Part I and provides evidence concerning these hypotheses.

Part I

Procedure:

On April 11, 1973, the entire senior class of Centre College was scheduled to participate in the college testing program. The Office of Institutional Research took this opportunity to survey these students' attitudes toward faculty and course evaluation. Only seniors were included in the survey for a variety of reasons, chief of which was the fact that they would not again be participating in the course evaluation program so participation in the survey would not bias the evaluation results. Because of illness or other emergencies, five students were absent from the scheduled testing session. The other 145 or 97% of the senior class was in attendance and completed the questionnaire.

The questionnaire consisted of 37 items each of which had three response categories. The responses were: Yes - if the item reflected the student's attitude; No - if the item did not reflect his attitude and ? - if the student could not make up his mind. The students, although requested to complete all items, had the option to leave any item blank. The seniors were also asked to identify themselves according to sex and the division which included their major. Centre College has three divisions, Humanities, Social Studies and Sciences which roughly parallel the traditional liberal arts structure.

The first 36 items on the questionnaire were divided into four categories.

These were: 1) items concerning the student's right and ability to evaluate teaching (four items); 2) items concerning the student's objectivity in completing evaluation forms (nine items); 3) items concerning the procedures used in conducting the course evaluations (seven items), and; 4) items concerning the use to be made of the student responses. Item 37 asked the students' opinion concerning the contribution of course evaluations to the improvement of instruction.

Insert Table 1 here

Results:

The overall results are presented in Table 1. The respondents generally felt that the evaluation of courses and instruction by students was a feasible procedure. Ninety-five per cent felt that they had the right to evaluate, 61% felt they knew enough about teaching and 57% felt they knew enough subject matter to adequately evaluate teaching effectiveness. The overall tenor of the responses concerning objectivity was that the students had been fair in their evaluations of courses and instruction. Concerning the mechanics of administering the course evaluations, there was ambivalence concerning the appropriate place in the term for the evaluations. This ambivalence is shared by the faculty and administration at Centre College. In general the respondents did not want personnel decisions to be heavily weighted on the results of student evaluations of instruction. This attitude applied consistently to faculty raises, prmotion and tenure. These results are consistent with the findings of Costin, Greenough, and Menges (1971). Concerning the question of whether course evaluations had contributed to the improvement of instruction, 46% responded yes and 41% responded no. The remaining 14% felt unqualified to respond, since they had no knowledge of the results of previous course evaluations.

In summary, the seniors felt that they could and did evaluate faculty fairly on the basis of valid criteria. At the same time, the students wanted the responses to go back to the instructor for his use in improving the course and instruction and did not want them to be weighted heavily for administrative decisions, concerning salary increases, promotion and tenure.

At the same time, there are great differences among seniors in their attitudes. The results of eighteen of the thirty-seven items distributed by

---

Insert Table 2 here

---

respondents' sex and the division which encompasses their major are shown in Table 2. These are the items for which there were great discrepancies between various subgroups in the students surveyed. Humanities students tended to respond in one of two ways. On several items they gave responses which represented idealistic views toward evaluations. On other items they gave "don't know" responses showing some hesitancy to commit themselves. Science students gave responses which showed a more pragmatic view toward course evaluation. Social studies students usually fell between these two positions. There is little difference between the attitudes of males and females except for two related items. Females have a greater desire to have evaluations early enough in the term to have an effect on the way the course is taught and are more strongly opposed to having the evaluation on the day of the final.

Implications:

One of the major responses to the pressure for accountability in post-secondary education is the creation of systems of course evaluation. Many institutions use the results of the evaluations for administrative personnel decisions - decisions which will have a long term effect on higher education. It is, of

course, inappropriate to generalize from the results of one, small private liberal arts college. However, the results do seem to agree with those found at a large state university - at least in one department. More attention should be paid to what students think they are doing when they are evaluating courses and instruction. It is quite possible that students will respond differently when they are having an input concerning a professor's academic career than they will when they are informing him of their perceptions of his strengths and weaknesses as a teacher. Much effort and money have been expended to develop objective faculty and course evaluation techniques. If students complete evaluation with one purpose in mind only to have the results used for different ends, the resulting decisions are open to error.

Care must be taken that an objective system of accountability not be discredited to the point of replacement by a system of hearsay and political maneuvering.

The other important implication is related to the fact that students differ in their attitudes toward course evaluation and that these differences can be related to demographic variables. In other words, a group of students responding to a course evaluation represent not one but several populations which have differing attitudes toward course evaluation. It is the purpose of Part II of this study to present preliminary evidence concerning the effect of these attitudes on student reponses to a course evaluation instrument.

Part II

Note:

In several respects, Part II of this study should not be reported, especially in as seemingly a statistical format as it is presented in this paper. First, the data presented was not gathered as part of a research study

but as part of a course evaluation conducted at Centre College. In this respect, the data presented can be considered post hoc evidence since it was not gathered specifically to test the hypotheses which will be considered in this part of the paper. Of much greater importance, however, is this writer's contention that the data used to derive the tables in this section are not amenable to summarization or analysis using classical statistical procedures. There were 75 faculty members rated in 169 classes or 2.25 classes per faculty member. Also, 804 students completed 3,210 evaluation forms in 169 classes or 3.99 evaluations per student. It is quite apparent that the 169 instructor scores and 169 course scores which are summarized in Tables 3 through 9 do not represent sets of 169 independent observations. What is probably the fundamental assumption of classical statistics is not met by these data. In the absence of appropriate statistical procedures, however, the summaries and analysis in this part of the paper are presented, not because they are right, but because they are useful in providing some evidence concerning the hypotheses under study. For this reason and because of the post hoc nature of these data only descriptive analyses are presented without application of any inference procedures. It is hoped that this presentation will motivate others to conduct research studies which will test the hypotheses about which only limited information can be presented in this report.

Hypotheses:

The findings in the first part of this paper seem to say that students (at least seniors) with differing academic orientations have different attitudes toward course evaluations. Logical extensions of this implication are the questions: Do students with differing attitudes toward course evaluation respond differently when they complete evaluation forms? Do students

with demonstrably different characteristics responded differently when they complete evaluation forms? The data available provides evidence concerning four specific hypotheses related to these questions.

Hypothesis 1: Students with differing academic preparations have differing views of course evaluation and respond differently on evaluation forms.

Hypothesis 2: Students at differing levels of preparation respond differently on course evaluation forms.

Hypothesis 3: Student attitudes and responses vary as a function of the time of day when a class which they are evaluating is held.

Hypothesis 4: Student attitudes and responses are related to the size of the class which they are evaluating.

Procedure:

During the Fall Term, 1973, the Centre College Committee on Evaluation devised the form presented in Figure 1. The format was developed locally and the evaluation items, which came from a variety of sources, were revised

---

Insert Figure 1 here

---

to meet local needs. On the form, items 6 through 15 were identified as items concerning the instructor and items 16 through 24 were items concerning the course. Instead of having global items concerning the instructor and the course, overall ratings were derived by summing the item means for the instructor items, yielding a possible score of 50, and for the course items, yielding a possible score of 45. The evaluations were conducted in all classes. Computer summaries of the results and all student comments were reviewed by the Dean of the College and the Dean of Instruction before the results were returned to the individual instructor. Copies of the computer summaries were retained by the Office of Institutional Research and Evaluation for research

purposes. The results reported below represent some of the analyses of the data.

Results:

Evidence concerning the first and second hypotheses is presented in Tables 3 - 6. Table 3 contains percentile distributions for overall instructor

---

Insert Tables 3 and 4 here

---

scores with academic divisions reported separately by academic level. The three divisions of the College, Humanities, Social Studies, and Science and Mathematics are identified within three academic levels, Freshman, Sophomore and Junior/Senior. Juniors and Seniors are combined because at these levels courses are taken when offered and the distinction becomes blurred.

Table 4 presents the same data for instructors but with academic levels reported separately by division. In general Humanities instructors are rated highest while Science and Mathematics instructors are rated lowest. Freshman tend to rate instructors lowest while Juniors and Seniors rate them highest. The only exception to this is the distribution of Junior/Senior Social Studies scores which is lower than expected.

Table 5 contains percentile distributions for overall course scores with

---

Insert Tables 5 and 6 here

---

academic divisions reported separately by student level and Table 6 contains the percentile distributions for overall course scores with student levels reported separately by academic division. The results for overall course scores are generally consistent with the instructor scores, that is, Humanities highest, Science and Math lowest; Freshman lowest, Juniors and Seniors highest. For course scores, Junior/Senior Social Studies and Junior/Senior Science and

Math ratings are lower than expected.

Centre College uses a weekly schedule in which classes meet twice a week for a ninety minute period. Classes meet Monday-Thursday or Tuesday-Friday. There are four time blocks each day beginning at 8:30, 10:30, 12:30 and 2:30. Mean ratings by division and by academic level were computed for each time block for both overall instructor and overall course scores in order to provide evidence concerning the third hypothesis. Table 7 presents the distribution of overall instructor scores for division and level across time blocks.

Insert Tables 7 and 8 here

Table 8 presents the distribution of overall course scores for division and level across time blocks. For both instructor and course ratings there does not seem to be a discernable pattern.

Finally, in order to present evidence concerning the fourth hypothesis, Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients were computed between class size and overall instructor ratings and between class size and overall course

---

Insert Table 9 here

---

ratings for the various division-academic level combinations. The results are presented in Table 9. Here again no consistent pattern seems to be present and in no case is more than 21% of the variance in ratings explained by variance in class size. The fact that both positive and negative correlations are present is further evidence of inconsistency of results.

In summary, the evidence seems to support hypotheses 1 and 2, but does not seem to support hypotheses 3 and 4. The division of the course being rated and the academic level of the student doing the rating seem to be related to the ratings which an instructor and a course receive. At the same time,

the time of day during which a class is given and the size of the class do not seem to affect the ratings.

Implications:

As was stated previously, this study could not prove or disprove beyond doubt the existence of relationships between student attitudes and the way the students respond to evaluations of instruction and courses. Doubt should have been created, however, as to whether all students respond to evaluations in the same way.

Two recommendations arise from this study. First, there is need for research, with appropriate and adequate data, to determine the relationships between student attitudes and their responses to course evaluation. Second, until more is known concerning these relationships, comparative judgments of instructors and courses should be made only within small discipline by student level units. It seems most inappropriate to compare the ratings in Freshman science courses with the ratings in Senior literature or art courses.

References:

Costin, F., Greenough, W. T., and Menges, R. J. Student Ratings of College Teaching: Reliability, validity and usefulness, Review of Educational Research, Vol. 41, No. 5, December 1971, pp. 522-24.

Remmers, H. H., in Gage, N. L. (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching 1963, Rand McNally, Chicago, p. 329.

TABLE 1

Combined Responses of Seniors to Survey of Attitudes Concerning Faculty and Course Evaluation

(Responses Expressed in Per Cent)

Survey Item No.		Survey Item	Responses			
			Yes	No	?	Blank
		PART I - Feasibility				
1.	(1)	Students should be permitted to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of Centre Faculty.	99	1	1	0
2.	(29)	Students have the right to evaluate the teaching effectiveness of Centre Faculty.	95	1	3	1
3.	(10)	Students know enough about teaching methodology to evaluate teaching effectiveness	61	16	21	2
4.	(19)	Students know enough subject matter to evaluate teaching effectiveness.	57	19	22	2
		PART II - Objectivity				
5.	(31)	I have always given professors fair evaluations	79	6	14	1
6.	(23)	If I didn't like the course, I rated everything low.	11	85	1	3
7.	(18)	If I didn't like the professor, I rated everything low.	8	84	4	4
8.	(21)	I have rated a professor on my general attitude toward the person and not his/her performance in a particular class.	7	80	8	5
9.	(3)	If I liked the subject area, I rated everything high.	8	88	2	2
10.	(27)	If I felt I was going to get a good grade in a course, I tended to rate the course and professor high.	12	80	5	3
11.	(12)	I have tended to give higher ratings to easier courses.	9	85	4	2
12.	(25)	I have given higher ratings to courses which have been important educational experiences.	88	7	5	1
13.	(16)	I could better evaluate a course or professor the year after the course following the opportunity to use the material I learned.	13	75	8	3

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

Survey Item No.		Survey Item	Responses Yes	No	?	Blank
		PART III - Mechanics				
14.	(2)	Some results of a faculty and course evaluation should be published.	80	14	6	0
15.	(5)	Course evaluations should be conducted early enough in the term to have effect on the way the course is being taught.	48	37	13	3
16.	(6)	I prefer to have the course evaluations the last day of class	43	49	7	1
17.	(14)	I prefer to have the course evaluations the day of the final.	15	74	6	5
18.	(34)	I would welcome the opportunity to evaluate all of the faculty during the spring of my senior year.	47	39	10	3
19.	(35)	I could more adequately evaluate faculty and courses at the end of my four years at Centre.	51	36	11	2
20.	(36)	I would be willing to respond to a survey about my educational experiences at Centre two or three years after I have graduated.	85	12	0	3
		PART IV - Use of Results				
21.	(7)	Decisions concerning faculty raises should be based solely on student evaluations.	1	90	6	3
22.	(13)	Decisions concerning faculty raises should be based primarily on student evaluations.	18	72	7	3
23.	(18)	Decisions concerning faculty raises should be based in a minor way on student evaluations.	68	23	8	1
24.	(15)	Decisions concerning faculty promotion should be based solely on student evaluations.	4	88	6	5
25.	(26)	Decisions concerning faculty promotion should be based primarily on student evaluations.	23	62	10	5
26.	(30)	Decisions concerning faculty promotion should be based in a minor way on student evaluations.	74	14	8	3
27.	(17)	Decisions concerning faculty tenure should be based solely on student evaluations.	9	84	4	3
28.	(22)	Decisions concerning faculty tenure should be based primarily on student evaluations.	24	63	8	4

TABLE 1 (Cont.)

Survey Item No.		Survey Item	Responses Yes	No	?	Blank
		PART IV - Use of Results (Cont.)				
29.	(32)	Decisions concerning tenure should be based in a minor way on student evaluations.	72	15	8	6
30.	(4)	Untenured faculty who receive high student evaluations should be given early promotions.	40	33	25	2
31.	(20)	Untenured faculty who receive high student evaluations should be given early tenure.	30	46	20	5
32.	(11)	Untenured faculty members who receive low evaluations should not have their appointments renewed.	25	42	31	2
33.	(28)	Untenured faculty who receive low evaluations should be assisted in improving their instruction by senior faculty.	76	11	11	2
34.	(9)	Tenured faculty members who receive low evaluations should be required to improve their teaching.	88	6	4	1
35.	(24)	Tenured faculty members who receive low evaluations should be cut in salary.	19	61	17	3
36.	(33)	Teachers should change their teaching methods to improve their ratings.	70	12	16	2
37.	(37)	Do you feel that the evaluation of courses at Centre has contributed to the improvement of instruction?	46	41	*	14

* Response categories were: Yes; No.

Table 2

Percentage Distribution, by Sex and Division of Major, for Selected Attitude Survey Items.

Distribution of Students by Sex and Division of Major

	Humanities	Social Studies	Science, Math	Total
Female	26	14	20	60
Male	14	40	31	85
Total	40	54	51	145

(The percentages reported below are based on the cell, column and row frequencies shown in this table.)

Selected Attitude Survey Items.
PART II - Objectivity

5. Item 31. I have always given professors fair evaluations.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	62	19	19	0	79	0	21	0	85	5	10	0	73	10	17	0
Male	79	0	14	7	85	3	13	0	84	3	10	3	84	2	12	2
Total	68	13	18	3	83	2	15	0	84	4	10	2	79	6	14	1

7. Item 8. If I didn't like the professor, I rated everything low.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	8	88	0	4	14	79	7	0	10	90	0	0	10	87	2	2
Male	0	100	0	0	10	85	5	0	3	71	10	16	6	82	6	6
Total	5	93	0	3	11	83	6	0	6	78	6	10	8	84	4	4

9. Item 3. If I liked the subject area I rated everything high.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	0	96	0	4	21	71	7	0	10	85	0	5	8	87	2	3
Male	0	100	0	0	13	83	0	0	3	87	6	3	7	89	2	1
Total	0	98	0	3	15	83	2	0	6	86	4	4	8	88	2	2

10. Item 27. If I felt I was going to get a good grade in a course, I tended to rate the course and professor high.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	8	85	8	0	21	64	14	0	20	70	10	0	15	75	10	0
Male	0	100	0	0	5	95	0	0	23	61	3	13	11	84	1	5
Total	5	90	5	0	9	87	4	0	22	65	6	8	12	80	5	3

11. Item 12. I have tended to give higher ratings to easier courses.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	8	88	4	0	0	93	7	0	15	80	5	0	8	87	5	0
Male	0	100	0	0	8	90	3	0	16	68	6	10	9	84	4	4
Total	5	93	3	0	6	91	4	0	16	73	6	6	9	85	4	2

13. Item 16. I could better evaluate a course or professor the year after the course following the opportunity to use the material I learned.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	8	81	12	0	14	79	7	0	0	90	5	5	7	83	8	2
Male	21	50	21	7	5	90	5	0	32	52	6	10	18	69	8	5
Total	13	70	15	3	7	87	6	0	20	67	6	8	13	75	8	3

15. Item 5. Course Evaluations should be conducted early enough in the term to have effect on the way the course is being taught.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	69	15	15	0	57	36	7	0	50	30	20	0	60	25	15	0
Male	50	36	14	0	30	53	15	3	45	39	6	10	39	45	12	5
Total	63	23	15	0	37	48	13	2	47	35	12	6	48	37	13	3

16. Item 6. I prefer to have the course evaluations the last day of class.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	27	65	8	0	43	50	7	0	50	45	5	0	38	55	7	0
Male	36	57	7	0	53	43	5	0	42	42	10	6	46	45	7	2
Total	30	63	8	0	50	44	6	0	45	43	8	4	43	49	7	1

17. Item 14. I prefer to have the course evaluations the day of the final.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	0	100	0	0	14	79	7	0	20	65	10	5	10	83	5	2
Male	36	50	0	14	18	75	8	0	13	68	6	13	19	68	6	7
Total	13	83	0	5	17	76	7	0	16	67	8	10	15	74	6	5

25. Item 26. Decisions concerning faculty promotion should be based primarily on student evaluations.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	19	58	19	4	21	79	0	0	25	65	5	5	22	65	10	3
Male	21	36	29	14	28	68	5	0	23	61	6	10	25	60	9	6
Total	20	50	23	8	26	70	4	0	24	63	6	8	23	62	10	5

27. Item 17. Decisions concerning faculty tenure should be based solely on student evaluations

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	4	81	15	0	7	93	0	0	15	80	5	0	8	83	8	0
Male	0	86	7	7	5	95	0	0	19	71	0	10	9	85	1	5
Total	3	83	13	3	6	94	0	0	18	75	2	6	9	84	4	3

28. Item 22. Decisions concerning tenure should be based primarily on student evaluations.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	31	54	12	4	7	86	7	0	20	75	0	5	22	68	7	3
Male	36	36	21	7	25	68	8	0	23	61	6	10	26	60	9	5
Total	33	48	15	5	20	72	7	0	22	67	4	8	24	63	8	4

30. Item 4. Untenured faculty who receive high student evaluations should be given early promotions.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	42	23	35	0	43	43	14	0	25	45	25	5	37	35	27	2
Male	64	7	29	0	38	33	30	0	39	42	13	6	42	32	24	2
Total	50	18	33	0	39	35	26	0	33	43	18	6	40	33	25	2

31. Item 20. Untenured faculty who receive high evaluations should be given early tenure.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	27	35	35	4	29	50	21	0	40	45	10	5	32	42	23	3
Male	43	29	14	14	25	50	25	0	26	55	10	10	28	48	18	6
Total	33	33	28	8	26	50	24	0	31	51	10	8	30	46	20	5

33. Item 28. Untenured faculty who receive low evaluations should be assisted in improving their instruction by senior faculty.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	65	15	19	0	79	7	14	0	70	10	20	0	70	12	18	0
Male	57	36	7	0	90	3	8	0	77	10	3	10	80	11	6	4
Total	63	23	15	0	87	4	9	0	75	10	10	6	76	11	11	2

35. Item 24. Tenured faculty members who receive low evaluations should be cut in salary.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	19	54	23	4	14	71	14	0	20	65	15	0	18	62	18	2
Male	29	50	21	0	20	73	8	0	16	52	23	10	20	61	15	4
Total	23	53	23	3	19	72	9	0	18	57	20	6	19	61	17	3

36. Item 33. Teachers should change their teaching methods to improve their ratings.

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	62	19	15	4	79	7	14	0	80	5	15	0	72	12	15	2
Male	57	14	21	7	80	5	15	0	61	19	16	3	69	12	16	2
Total	60	18	18	5	80	6	15	0	69	14	16	2	70	12	16	2

37. Item 37. Do you feel that the evaluation of courses at Centre has contributed to the improvement of instruction?

	Humanities				Social Studies				Science, Math				Total			
	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank	Y	N	?	Blank
Female	38	50	0	12	50	36	0	14	40	40	0	20	42	43	0	15
Male	7	64	0	29	55	33	0	13	58	35	0	6	48	39	0	13
Total	28	55	0	18	54	33	0	13	51	37	0	12	46	41	0	14

Figure 1.

CENTRE INSTRUCTIONAL RATING FORM

Course_____ Date_____

Fill out this form by placing the appropriate letter in the blank before each statement. When you have completed the form, transfer your responses to the accompanying data card.

PART I

For each of the first five questions, select the one response which best describes your situation.

_____ 1. I took this course because it was (a) a graduation requirement; (b) a major program requirement; (c) a major program elective; (d) a general elective; (e) of interest to me.

_____ 2. For this course, I expect to get a grade of (a) B+ or better; (b) B; (c) C+; (d) C; (e) below C.

_____ 3. I have been absent from this class (a) two or less times; (b) 3-5 times; (c) 6-10 times; (d) 10-15 times; (e) over 15 times.

_____ 4. I started this course with (a) great enthusiasm; (b) mild interest; (c) the attitude that I had to take the course; (d) apprehension about my ability to succeed; (e) a negative attitude.

_____ 5. This course (a) greatly exceeded my expectations; (b) exceeded my expectations; (c) met my expectations; (d) did not meet my expectations; (e) was nothing like what I expected.

PART II

Use the following code for Items 6-24

A - STRONGLY AGREE	You strongly agree with this statement as it applies to this course or instructor.
B - AGREE	You agree more than you disagree with this statement as it applies to this course or instructor.
C - NEUTRAL	You have neither a positive nor a negative response to this statement as it applies to this course or instructor.
D - DISAGREE	You disagree more than you agree with this statement as it applies to this course or instructor.
E - STRONGLY DISAGREE	You strongly disagree with this statement as it applies to this course or instructor.

If an item does not apply to the professor or course, put NA in the appropriate space on this form and fill in the space for the item number on the data card.

Please make any comment you wish in the space under the appropriate item.

_____ 6. The instructor seems to know the subject matter.

_____ 7. The instructor uses class (lectures, lab, studio) time well.

_____ 8. The instructor presents course material in an interesting way.

_____ 9. The instructor's manner of presentation (voice, actions, etc.) assists learning.

(over)

Figure 1. (cont.)

PART II (cont'd)

_____ 10. The instructor senses when students are having difficulty with the material.

_____ 11. The instructor encourages questions and spends adequate time answering them.

_____ 12. The instructor grades fairly.

_____ 13. The instructor conveys his interest in the subject matter.

_____ 14. The instructor is available for extra help outside of class.

_____ 15. The instructor respects students as persons.

_____ 16. This course was organized in a manner which aided learning.

_____ 17. The course emphasized understanding of the subject matter.

_____ 18. The assignments contributed to the learning of the subject matter.

_____ 19. The overall work load of the course was reasonable.

_____ 20. I was given sufficient opportunities to show what I know about the subject.

_____ 21. The instructor's objectives for this course have been fulfilled.

_____ 22. This course has helped me improve my ability to think.

_____ 23. This course has contributed to my intellectual development.

_____ 24. This course has increased my interest in the subject.

General Comments concerning the course and the instruction.

Table 3

Percentile Distributions for Instructor Scores

	Divisions within Academic Levels															
	Freshmen				Sophomores					Juniors/Seniors					College	
Score	Hum	Soc Stud	Sci Math	Total	Score	Hum	Soc Stud	Sci Math	Total	Score	Hum	Soc Stud	Sci Math	Total	Total	Score
50					50					50	99			99	99	50
49					49					49	96			99	99	49
48	98			99	48					48	90			96	98	48
47	94	96		97	47	92	96	95	95	47	79		95	91	94	47
46	90	92		96	46	83	93	82	86	46	71	89	86	82	88	46
45	85	88	96	90	45	75	89	68	78	45	65	74	77	72	80	45
44	71	77	81	76	44	63	79	64	69	44	56	65	64	62	69	44
43	56	65	67	62	43	50	61	64	58	43	48	57	50	51	57	43
42	44	54	63	53	42	38	50	59	49	42	38	48	45	48	48	42
41	33	42	60	45	41	21	36	50	35	41	29	37	45	37	40	41
40	23	31	46	36	40	8	21	45	24	40	21	26	36	29	30	40
39	17	23	27	22	39	8	18	36	20	39	17	20	25	20	21	39
38	12	19	17	15	38	8	7	27	14	38	8	17	18	14	14	38
37	6	15	13	10	37	8		18	8	37	2	13	7	7	9	37
36	4	15	10	9	36	4		9	4	36		7		2	5	36
35	4	12	8	7	35			9	3	35		2		1	4	35
34	4	8	4	5	34			5	1	34					2	34
33	4	4		2	33					33					1	33
32	2			1	32					32					1	32
Number	26	13	24	63	Number	12	14	11	37	Number	24	23	22	69	169	Number
Mean	42.07	41.05	40.47	41.25	Mean	42.78	42.08	41.12	42.02	Mean	43.32	41.88	41.94	42.40	41.89	Mean
S.D.	3.26	3.63	3.23	3.41	S.D.	2.95	2.49	4.18	3.29	S.D.	3.52	3.47	3.32	3.50	3.46	S.D.

Table 4

Percentile Distributions for Instructor Scores

Academic Levels within Division

Score	Humanities				Score	Social Studies				Score	Science - Math				College Total	Score
	Fr	So	Jr-Sr	Total		Fr	So	Jr-Sr	Total		Fr	So	Jr-Sr	Total		
50			99	99	50					50					99	50
49			96	98	49					49					99	49
48	98		90	95	48					48					98	48
47	94	92	79	88	47	96	96		98	47		95	95	97	94	47
46	90	83	71	81	46	92	93	89	91	46		82	86	91	88	46
45	85	75	65	75	45	88	89	74	82	45	96	68	77	83	80	45
44	71	63	56	64	44	77	79	65	72	44	81	64	64	71	69	44
43	56	50	48	52	43	65	61	57	60	43	67	64	50	60	57	43
42	44	38	38	40	42	54	50	48	50	42	63	59	45	55	48	42
41	33	21	29	29	41	42	36	37	38	41	60	50	45	53	40	41
40	23	8	21	21	40	31	21	26	26	40	46	45	36	42	30	40
39	17	8	17	15	39	23	18	20	20	39	27	36	25	28	21	39
38	12	8	8	10	38	19	7	17	15	38	17	27	18	19	14	38
37	6	8	2	5	37	15		13	10	37	13	18	7	11	9	37
36	4	4		2	36	15		7	7	36	10	9		5	5	36
35	4			2	35	12		2	6	35	8	9		5	4	35
34	4			2	34	8			2	34	4	5		3	2	34
33	4			2	33	4			1	33					1	33
32	2			1	32					32					1	32
Number	26	12	24	62	Number	13	14	23	50	Number	24	11	22	57	169	Number
Mean	42.07	42.78	43.32	42.69	Mean	41.05	42.08	41.88	41.72	Mean	40.47	41.12	41.94	41.16	41.89	Mean
S.D.	3.26	2.95	3.52	3.36	S.D.	3.63	2.49	3.47	3.30	S.D.	3.23	4.18	3.32	3.53	3.46	S.D.

Table 5

Percentile Distributions for Course Scores

	Divisions within Academic Levels															
	Freshmen				Sophomores					Juniors/Seniors				College	
Score	Hum	Soc Stud	Sci Math	Total	Score	Hum	Soc Stud	Sci Math	Total	Score	Hum	Soc Stud	Sci Math	Total	Total	Score
45					45					45						45
44					44					44	98			99	99	44
43					43					43	94			98	99	43
42					42		96		99	42	88			96	98	42
41		96		99	41		93	95	96	41	79			93	96	41
40		92		98	40	96	93	82	91	40	71	96	95	87	92	40
39	92	88		94	39	79	93	73	82	39	56	89	89	78	85	39
38	79	81		87	38	58	93	73	76	38	42	76	77	64	75	38
37	71	69	92	79	37	46	86	64	66	37	33	59	61	51	64	37
36	52	54	79	63	36	33	61	50	48	36	25	43	50	39	50	36
35	27	42	65	44	35	21	36	41	32	35	21	30	43	31	36	35
34	15	31	50	32	34	17	18	36	23	34	15	24	39	25	27	34
33	8	19	35	21	33	13	7	32	16	33	8	22	30	20	19	33
32	4	8	26	11	32	4	7	27	12	32	6	17	20	14	13	32
31	4		13	6	31		4	18	7	31	4	13	16	11	8	31
30	4		8	5	30			9	3	30	2	9	7	6	5	30
29	2		4	2	29			9	3	29		4		1	2	29
28					28			5	1	28		4		1	1	28
27					27					27		2		1	1	27
Number	26	13	24	63	Number	12	14	11	37	Number	24	23	22	69	169	Number
Mean	35.92	35.65	33.81	35.06	Mean	36.84	35.73	35.39	35.99	Mean	37.79	35.59	35.32	36.33	35.78	Mean
S.D.	2.19	2.56	2.28	2.50	S.D.	2.28	2.46	3.87	2.96	S.D.	3.37	3.35	3.17	3.51	3.10	S.D.

Table 6

Percentile Distributions for Course Scores

Academic Levels within Divisions

Score	Humanities				Score	Social Studies				Score	Science - Math				College Total	Score
	Fr	So	Jr-Sr	Total		Fr	So	Jr-Sr	Total		Fr	So	Jr-Sr	Total		
45					45					45						45
44			98	99	44					44					99	44
43			94	98	43					43					99	43
42			88	95	42		96		99	42					98	42
41			79	92	41	96	93		97	41		95		99	96	41
40		96	71	88	40	92	93	96	94	40		82	95	95	92	40
39	92	79	56	76	39	88	93	89	90	39		73	89	90	85	39
38	79	58	42	60	38	81	93	76	82	38		73	77	86	75	38
37	71	46	33	52	37	69	86	59	69	37	92	64	61	75	64	37
36	52	33	25	38	36	54	61	43	51	36	79	50	50	62	50	36
35	27	21	21	23	35	42	36	30	35	35	65	41	43	52	36	35
34	15	17	15	15	34	31	18	24	24	34	50	36	39	43	27	34
33	8	13	8	9	33	19	7	22	17	33	35	32	30	32	19	33
32	4	4	6	5	32	8	7	17	12	32	26	27	20	22	13	32
31	4		4	3	31		4	13	7	31	13	18	16	15	8	31
30	4		2	2	30			9	4	30	8	9	7	8	5	30
29	2			1	29			4	2	29	4	9		4	2	29
28					28			4	2	28		5		1	1	28
27					27			2	1	27					1	27
Number	26	12	24	62	Number	13	14	23	50	Number	24	11	22	57	169	Number
Mean	35.92	36.84	37.97	36.89	Mean	35.65	35.73	35.59	35.65	Mean	33.81	35.39	35.32	34.70	35.78	Mean
S.D.	2.19	2.28	3.37	2.87	S.D.	2.56	2.46	3.35	2.93	S.D.	2.28	3.87	3.17	3.09	3.10	S.D.

Table 7

Distribution of Instructor Scores by Time Blocks

	8:30-10 Block			10:30-12 Block			12:30-2 Block			2:30-4 Block		
	No.	Mean	S.D.	No.	Mean	S.D.	No.	Mean	S.D.	No.	Mean	S.D.
Humanities	15	42.83	4.00	15	43.45	3.55	20	41.64	2.93	12	43.31	2.28
Social Studies	5	38.98	2.98	17	42.97	2.57	13	41.29	2.92	14	41.78	3.60
Science-Math	15	40.32	3.99	14	41.34	3.73	14	41.72	3.23	14	41.34	2.85
Total	36	41.14	4.13	46	42.63	3.44	47	41.57	3.03	40	42.09	3.10
Freshmen	21	41.41	4.23	12	40.90	2.77	17	41.44	2.72	13	41.05	3.22
Sophomores	5	40.66	3.03	16	42.14	3.46	9	41.31	2.89	7	43.67	2.78
Jr.-Sr.	10	40.80	4.32	18	44.20	3.12	21	41.78	3.30	20	42.22	2.88

- - - -

Table 8

Distribution of Course Scores by Time Blocks

	8:30-10 Block			10:30-12 Block			12:30-2 Block			2:30-4 Block		
	No.	Mean	S.D.	No.	Mean	S.D.	No.	Mean	S.D.	No.	Mean	S.D.
Humanities	15	36.39	3.12	15	38.02	3.14	20	36.20	1.84	12	37.22	3.11
Social Studies	6	32.81	2.98	17	36.77	1.97	13	34.95	2.82	14	36.14	3.01
Science-Math	15	34.64	3.12	14	34.44	3.40	14	35.72	2.78	14	34.01	2.74
Total	36	35.07	3.35	46	36.47	3.20	47	35.71	2.49	40	35.72	3.23
Freshmen	21	35.21	2.56	12	34.84	2.55	17	35.66	1.83	13	34.22	2.85
Sophomores	5	35.36	2.95	16	36.48	3.32	9	35.05	2.11	7	36.51	2.67
Jr.-Sr.	10	34.61	4.71	18	37.54	3.02	21	36.04	3.00	20	36.42	3.31

- - - -

Table 9

Correlation Between Class Size and Student Ratings Distributed Across Academic Level by Division Dimensions

	Instructor Ratings				Course Ratings			
	Hum.	Soc Stud	Sci-Math	Total	Hum.	Soc Stud	Sci-Math	Total
Freshmen	-.01	-.42	.01	-.19	.12	-.28	-.18	-.23
Sophomores	.33	-.14	-.36	-.15	.46	-.31	-.32	-.19
Jr.-Sr.	.02	-.06	.27	-.01	.08	-.01	.17	-.05
Total	-.04	-.14	-.10	-.14	-.06	-.08	-.16	-.18